

Notes: Report of the Green Climate Fund to the Conference of the Parties and guidance to the Green Climate Fund - Contact group COP 8 (c)

Date: 11/21/2024

Time: 10:30am

Note Taker: Caitlin Grady, George Washington University

---

Chile: Intervention on noting the work of the TIP which is happening at the same time.

Turkey: 2h, would like to change the word to “other multilateral climate funds”

AGN: We made our comments yesterday. We can’t support this para with the deletion of “climate investment funds” we cannot support the request to include Multilateral dev banks. If that’s not acceptable we should delete this para.

US: would keep ‘scaling development” not put “banks” would that be acceptable to AGN?

AGN: no it would not be acceptable. Happy to keep the paragraph as originally proposed. Otherwise delete it.

US: Could we have a moment to think about moving this outside the welcome paragraph?

AGN: This is our reflection on something that has happen between the GCF and those three funds and we don’t want to welcome it. If you don’t want to welcome it don’t welcome it. We maintain our objection to the revised paragraph on multlat development banks.

US: we are not willing to accept the deletion right now. Leave it in brackets.

Chair: we don’t agree then we can take it out. We can move on for now. Should we remove brackets from para 5.

AGN: You did not reflect my point yesterday. The board does not have responsibility to strengthen partnerships with MDBs. Only the countries can do that, the board cannot do that. This fund needs to be driven by countries not others. This says that board should make progress and have relationships with MDBs. We cannot ask the board to violate our own decision to adopt a governance instrument that puts this in the hands of the countries. We cannot say countries work with MDBs to access the fund. This must be deleted

Chair: so we delete? Deleted

Arab Group: This para must be retained in this position. We maintain this. If it were to be deleted we would want to delete every mention of complementarity. We want to remove brackets

India: yes I want to retain it. We could move this para to CMA to others if that works? Could move from COP to CMA-

Arab Group: Happy to have it in both decisions but we want it in this one.

USA: happy to keep in principle but we see this as a package with 2H but depending on resolution of 2H may come back.

Turkey: would like to keep

India: Para 7- I discussed with colleague from AGN and EU and we have bridging proposal. “Request the board to continue to streamline and simplify access to funding by reducing median times taken during GCF 2 to process accreditation, readiness, PAP, and SAP proposals from review to first disbursement, relative to GCF 1 with an emphasis on reducing time to process funding proposals in line with strategic plan 2024 – 2027. “

Chair: can we accept? Ok, now para 7

India: we can remove with an emphasis on lowering co-financing requirements

Chair: para 18

Burkina Faso: can we reflect on para 7 now. Can we reflect on this paragraph?

Chair: ok keep it in brackets

AOSIS: After conversations with secretariat we can delete para 18

Chair: para 20? NCQG placeholder

USA: We would like to delete para 20, in the adaptation fund text we agreed to remove the NCQG placeholder and we want it here too.

AGN: We cannot delete it here. GCF is a core component. GCF is higher rates than MDBs. We cannot do it. It's one of our funds.

Chair: ok so keep in brackets for 20

ILAC: supports AGN on keeping placeholder

Chair: para 21 and 22.

Brazil: In order to reflect what we have agreed I would like to do some adjustments. In line 7 I want to include “annually” after climate fund. In para 23,

Chile: There is an annex for this paragraph, should we go to that now or later?

Chair: para 22 is accepted with change

AGN: Our openness to consider para 21/22 but we are concerned with legal advice that we had to modify arrangements. We don't want to set a precedent. We don't concur with logic that we take this decision then postpone it's implementation. We could adopt the decision then implement it immediately as soon as board approves.

EU: : we have drafted this very important compromise, I agree with AGN, several parties have raised their points I suggest we keep it as it is and move forward. Adopt it as we have it.

AGN: Well ideally I'm struggling to understand the logic. We were not part of any compromise on this one, we are agreeing to do this simply because we've realized that giving guidance and board reporting back doesn't work. We've gone through this lengthy process.

Canada: need to go back to para 15 and include the para on indigenous peoples groups.

Chair: have you looked at 2k?

Canada: no thanks for pointing out, let me look briefly.

AGN: I have not heard 1 reasonable argument as to why we cannot implement effectively in 2025 so the next time we'd have guidance would be 2027. Then we could be representing properly the parties decision. I still don't get it but I will concede to the insanity of the room right now. We will accept by defeat but we are unhappy.

Chair: can we agree we remove brackets on 21 then?

Chile: Thanks, related to this, its related to reporting. In 2025 or 2027 we will have reports for GEF so little action. Should we add language that says we want the 2027 report to be more comprehensive?

EU: What you mention is already directly in the language in para 25, it is in the language in para 25. Please don't add more language to this compromise.

Georgia: Yesterday we read in this para in 15 but we need a minor tweak. Move knowledge and interest to in front of Indigenous peoples. And local communities added.

Arab Group: We would like to check this new insertion with our legal team. We have other comments under the CMA decision.

?: for 2k we should add local communities too

AUS: Quickly chair can I see a comma after indigenous peoples?

Turkey: 2H?

Chair: not yet there

AGN: Board already has policy that when it comes to indigenous people that includes local communities so we need to always include that. Board has a policy in terms of 16 and 17.

Canada: I don't think this addition would work for Canada prior and informed consent is not applicable to local communities. This has a very specific meaning to law internationally, we could include "local knowledge systems" in a way that respects the rights of indigenous peoples'

Chair: Parties need to take this offline and give us a compromised text

Arab Group: There is no problem with us with the original one but we need to discuss separately huddle if we are going to be changing. We don't see a need to have the changes now

Georgia: Thanks colleagues, first to add comma it becomes not grammatically correct. Please clarify Aus comma. I could be convinced of the value of alternative text.

Canada: no we can't accept.

Chair: can you guys huddle

Canada: what about deleting everything that's been uncertain. After informed consent what about "As well as incorporating the interests of local communities and local knowledge systems"

Ghana: we support the inclusion of local communities.

ILAC: we support indigenous people and local communities together. We don't support the last one from Canada. It's an agreed language we should not change it.

Chair: if parties cannot agree we have no option but to delete the text

Canada: would be happy to work with AGN and ILAC, we did agree previously on a version. Indigenous peoples has a definition but local communities do not.

AGN: Many developing countries are always complaining about GCF, some of these elements being proposed and pushed by others, this should not lead to additional conditionality on new things. That's why we need to say "in line with policies" we don't want additional conditionality.

NZ: we are over complicating this matter. The GCF indigenous people policy is very specific on this. So is the COP. In ref to strengthening knowledge systems. The words continue encourage. Keep the language and proceed.

Side huddle happening on text of that para. AGN, Canada, Arab group, maybe a couple others.

Departed room at 11:50am, session was ongoing.